

MINUTES OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
REGIONAL BICYCLE TASK FORCE AND  
PEDESTRIAN WORKING GROUP

Tuesday, July 20, 1999  
MAG Office Building, Suite 200 - Saguaro Room  
302 North First Avenue, Phoenix

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Patrick McDermott, Chandler, Chairman,  
Regional Bicycle Task Force  
Mike Branham, Surprise, Chairman, Pedestrian  
Working Group  
Michael Eagan, American Society of Landscape  
Architects  
Bruce Meyers, Arizona Department of  
Administration  
\*Mark Mansfield, ADOT  
Mickey Ohland, Chandler  
Tami Ryall, Gilbert  
Susan Bookspan, Glendale  
Richard Janke, Glendale

\*Larry Martinez, Goodyear  
Mike Cartsonis, Litchfield Park  
Aaron Iverson, Maricopa County  
Steve Hancock, Mesa  
Tracy Stevens, Peoria  
Lorry Kuiper, Phoenix Planning Department  
Mark Melnychenko, Phoenix Transit  
Richard Park for John Siefert, Phoenix  
Maureen Mageau-DeCindis, RPTA  
Amy MacAulay, Scottsdale  
Jorie Bresnahan, Scottsdale  
Eric Iwersen, Tempe

\*Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

OTHERS PRESENT

DD Barker, Citizen

Dawn Coomer, MAG

1. Call to Order

Chairman Pat McDermott and Chairman Mike Branham called the meeting to order at 1:09 p.m.

2. Approval of the May 18, 1999 Meeting Minutes of the Regional Bicycle Task Force

Steve Hancock moved to approve the May 18, 1999 meeting minutes, and Eric Iwersen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Approval of the June 17, 1999 Meeting Minutes of the Pedestrian Working Group

Steve Hancock moved to approve the June 17, 1999 meeting minutes, and Bruce Meyers seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Call to the Audience

DD Barker congratulated members of the committee on their efforts.

5. Funds Allocated to Regional Bicycle Marketing

Dawn Coomer addressed the committees to describe the agenda attachments. Maureen Mageau-DeCindis addressed the committees and distributed some information on Regional Bicycle marketing ideas. She requested that members call her to discuss the ideas further. Pat McDermott asked about the timeline for the information. Mike Cartsonis congratulated Maureen on her efforts. Maureen added that if a bike map is inserted into the bus book that a completed copy would be needed by November.

6. Regional Off-Street System Plan

Mike Branham noted that members of the Pedestrian Working Group had not addressed the project scope in much detail. He asked if anyone had some comments. Pat McDermott noted that integration with the on-road system would be important. Mike Cartsonis added that neighborhood planning should be addressed. Amy MacAulay asked if the pathways would be paved or unpaved. Mike Branham asked that any additional comments be given to MAG staff within two weeks.

7. Possible Changes to the Transportation Improvement Program Data Entry Process

Dawn Coomer provided an overview of the topic. She referred to the accelerated schedule for submitting federally funded projects shown in the agenda attachments. Projects would now be due the third week of September rather than the end of the calendar year. Tami Ryall asked if smaller jurisdictions would be able to submit the additional information. She noted that the additional requirements could become burdensome for those with limited staff. Eric Iwersen agreed, noting that a more bureaucratic process was not needed. Dawn said that she would express these concerns to MAG staff. Tami asked if the issue would be discussed at TRC, and Dawn responded that she didn't think it would. However, Paul Ward of MAG staff would be able to answer any additional questions.

8. Transportation Public Involvement Program

MAG staff provided an overview of this topic. Maureen Mageau-DeCindis noted that a survey at each table at a public meeting is helpful with staff who can assist with completion of the survey. Lorry Kuiper noted that using dots to prioritize different options at meetings helps people to feel involved in the planning process. Maureen added that a hotline number and having the public meetings televised on public access cable could be considered. Amy MacAulay noted that using the internet was a valuable tool, and Steve Hancock suggested inserting surveys into utility bills. Lorry added that Phoenix has village planning meetings. Amy added that she has a large mailing list which could be used, and that open meetings need to be a component of the overall process. Mike Branham suggested using a booth at fairs.

## 9. Comments on Enhancement Fund Applications

MAG staff provided an overview of the agenda item. Committee members were grouped into teams of three persons, and each team reviewed 3 applications. Major comments have been summarized below, and will be provided to the Enhancement Funds Working Group for their consideration.

### ***City of Avondale - McDowell Road Alternative Transportation Underpass West of Agua Fria River Bridge***

- ▶ This project is recommended for funding.
- ▶ 2000' foot pathway not clearly shown on maps or described in text.
- ▶ Not clear if existing path is paved or not.
- ▶ 10' width not sufficient for user mix.
- ▶ Will golf carts and horses be allowed?
- ▶ Cost seems low for an underpass.
- ▶ Does path and underpass access shopping center?

### ***City of Chandler - Chandler Paseo Project Phase Three***

- ▶ Match excellent
- ▶ City committed to ongoing program
- ▶ Has continuity, integrated into current and future planning
- ▶ This project is recommended for funding

### ***City of Chandler - Chandler Paseo Project Phase Six***

- ▶ Excellent bid
- ▶ This project is recommended for funding

### ***Town of Gilbert - Heritage Trail (Mesa and Chandler Segments) (2 projects)***

- ▶ This project is recommended for funding.
- ▶ Seems light on landscaping cost.
- ▶ User conflicts may occur (equestrian and paving).
- ▶ It would make sense to approve only if both segments would be part of a total package.

### ***City of Glendale - Historic Caitlin Court Alleyway Shared Use and Enhancement Project***

- ▶ This project is recommended for funding.

### ***City of Glendale - Glendale's Centennial Gateway Plaza***

- ▶ This project is recommended for funding.
- ▶ Would like to be sure underground storage tanks from Mobil station are removed.
- ▶ May consider pedestrian bridge from north side of canal to south side of canal.

***City of Glendale - Thunderbird Paseo Shared Use Path - Marshall Ranch Bridge to Sweetwater***

- ▶ Cost for this seems high.
- ▶ This project is recommended for funding.
- ▶ This project does meet AASHTO, good.
- ▶ This project should use landscaping category as second category eligibility.

***Maricopa County - McDowell Mountain Road Bicycle Lanes Project***

- ▶ This project is recommended for funding.

***City of Peoria - Grand Avenue (US 60) Pedestrian Crossing***

- ▶ Include recommendations from the MAG Mid-Block Crossing Study in designing this project, and the MAG Pedestrian Area Policies and Design Guidelines.
- ▶ This project is recommended for funding.

***City of Peoria - West Valley Multi-Modal Corridor Demonstration Project***

- ▶ This project is recommended for funding.
- ▶ Completes a portion of the Sun Circle Trail (very good).
- ▶ Regional trail (very good).
- ▶ (Need to?) Accommodate equestrian needs in addition to paved trail.

***City of Phoenix - 2<sup>nd</sup> Street Pedestrian and Landscaping Enhancement***

- ▶ Angled parking on west side of 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue is not good.
- ▶ Bike lane intersection treatments needed.
- ▶ Cross sections in application would be helpful.
- ▶ This project is recommended for funding.

***City of Phoenix - 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue Street Enhancement***

- ▶ More trees should be included in landscaping to provide shade for pedestrians.
- ▶ Should incorporate a bicycle element, and link to canals and bike lanes.
- ▶ Could propose a mid-block crossing.
- ▶ What kind of community support is there?
- ▶ This project is recommended for funding.

***City of Phoenix - Jackson Street Pedestrian Improvements***

- ▶ Can't read map very well. What are all the street names surrounding the project? What is in the gold box?
- ▶ Project seems to be only for Ball Park and serving those driving to a game/event. What are the other community benefits?
- ▶ Is this a parking lot beautification project?
- ▶ This project is recommended for funding, but should have a low priority.

***City of Tempe - Phase I of Creamery Railroad Multi-Use Path, Artist Designed Elements and Landscaping***

- ▶ Recommended for funding.

***City of Tempe - Rio Salado/Scottsdale Pathway Link, Rural Road to Indian Bend Wash***

- ▶ This project is recommended for funding.
- ▶ Offers very good connection to a regional system.

***City of Tempe - Tempe Canal Multi-Use Path***

- ▶ Does this provide connection to multi-use trail located west of 101 Freeway along the south side of the railroad track? This connection would be very important.
- ▶ Good project for low-income area.
- ▶ Good neighborhood connections.
- ▶ Developer cost share is a plus.
- ▶ This project is recommended for funding.

***Town of Wickenburg - US 60 Milepost 106.0 to Milepost 108.9 Project***

- ▶ Not recommended for funding as written.
- ▶ No diagram of typical intersection.
- ▶ May be more cost effective to improve shoulder; could do both sides
- ▶ If you straighten this path out and make it 8 feet wide, it would be a viable project. Five foot two-way path is not standard.
- ▶ Term bike lane and bike path confusing. Lane is on-road; path is paved off-road.
- ▶ Need to clarify - on one side of road only? Two way or one way travel?
- ▶ Possibly make a shoulder project?
- ▶ What about east end connection? How does it end? Will it extend further in the future? Does it meet something?
- ▶ Route to park is good
- ▶ Where are schools -- not shown. Who will use this? Tourists, school kids?
- ▶ Looks like path is not two-way, not on side with development.
- ▶ OK for funding IF 2 way 8 foot wide path on 1 side or 5' wide on both sides of roadway
- ▶ Need to define meander
- ▶ Is this a one time opportunity?

**10. Regional Bicycle Marketing**

This item was discussed earlier in the meeting under agenda item five.

**11. Next Meeting**

The Pedestrian Working Group will meet the second or third week of August to review the results of the update of the Regional Pedestrian Plan 2000. The next joint meeting of the Regional Bicycle Task Force and Pedestrian Working Group will be September 21, 1999 at 1:00 p.m.